DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 340 132 EA 023 583

AUTHOR Hofmann, Rich; Granger, John
TITLE Career-Bound and Place-Bound Superintendents' Attitudes toward Collective Bargaining.
PUB DATE Oct 91
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, October 16-19, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Characteristics; Administrator Responsibility; *Administrator Role; Arbitration; *Collective Bargaining; Elementary Secondary Education; *Superintendents
IDENTIFIERS *Ohio

ABSTRACT

A study explored the relationship between superintendent career aspirations and involvement in collective bargaining. Questionnaires mailed to 300 Ohio school superintendents yielded 241 responses, an 80 percent rate. Carlson's (1962) typology was used to classify superintendents as either career- or place-bound. Four factors of collective bargaining were identified--spokesperson and composition of the bargaining team, superintendent involvement, superintendent substitute, and use of specialized negotiators. Findings indicated that career-bound superintendents did not want to be involved in collaborative bargaining, while place-bound superintendents preferred to act as spokespersons. Neither group supported the use of an outside specialized negotiator, though the career-bound group expressed more negative attitudes than did their place-bound counterparts. Each type shared positive attitudes regarding the suggested composition of the bargaining team. Five tables are included. (14 references) (LMI)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED340182

# Career-Bound and Place-Bound Superintendents' Attitudes Toward Collective Bargaining

**Rich Hofmann , Miami University**
**John Granger, Edgerton Local School District**

## ABSTRACT

On the basis of their responses to a questionaire, a random sample of 241 Ohio superintendents were classified as either career-bound or place-bound. An exploratory factor analyses of their responses to an eighteen statement attitude instrument defined four factors that were subsequently confirmed by confirmatory factor analysis as well. Three of the factors deal with the spokesperson and composition of the management team in collective bargaining. The fourth factor deals with superintendent involvement in collective bargaining. Analysis of mean scores on the factors by superintendent type indicate that the superintendents have significantly ($p<.01$) different attitudes on three of the factors.

The results of the anlyses suggets three major conclusions. The career-bound superintendent has no desire to be involved in collective bargaining in any capacity. The place-bound superintendent prefers to be actively involved with the collective bargaining team, preferably as the spokesperson. Neither superintendent supports the use of outside specialized negotiators, but the career-bound superintendents are much more negative than the place-bound superintendents regarding this issue. Both superintendent types share similar positive attitudes regarding the suggested make-up of the management bargaining team.

Implications for future research are also discussed along with several suggestions for using the results.

**Paper presented at the Mid-Western Educational Research Association Conference, Chicago, October 16-19, 1991. Requests for copies of this ms. should be sent to:**

**Dr. Rich Hofmann**
**Department of Ed. Leadership**
**350 McGuffey Hall**
**Miami University**
**Oxford, Ohio 45056**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Hofmann

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 023 583

2 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## BACKGROUND AND GENERAL PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to integrate Carlson's (1962) superintendent typology, place-bound and career-bound, into the context of collective bargaining in the public schools. Such an integration was undertaken to assist educators in understanding and predicting the various roles that individual superintendents may choose to assume in the collective bargaining process.

### The Place-Bound Superintendent: Insiders

Place-bound superintendents, as defined by Carleson (1962), are insiders who work within a school system until the highest position is achieved. Their careers are often ascents through the hierarchy in one or two school systems. Frequently, place-bound superintendents complete their careers in the same school district in which they were promoted. Although the career of the place-bound superintendent is commonly focused in one district, this person may have changed districts earlier in the career. If the place-bound superintendent vacates the superintendency before retirement age, it is often to accept a lower-level administrative position in the same district (Hoy & Miskel, 1987).

The place-bound superintendent is an individual who waits for the position of superintendent to open in a specific school district. Although the waiting may be in vain, the individual continues to wait. The place-bound superintendent is usually older than the person who does not wait in a specific district. The place-bound superintendent is sometimes referred to as an insider because he or she is often hired to the superintendent position from within the system. The place-bound superintendent has held one or more positions in the district immediately before becoming the superintendent. Ordinarily these individuals complete their careers as superintendents in a single school system and are therefore one-district or one-city superintendents.

### The Career-Bound Superintendent: Outsiders

The career-bound superintendent is the individual who does not wait for a superintendency in one specific school district. This person seeks the position of superintendent without geographic restriction. The career-bound superintendent is more dedicated to the profession of the superintendency than to the specific community or geographic location (Hoy and Miskel, 1987). This individual is amenable to moving from one area to another to accept the superintendency. Therefore, this person is sometimes referred to as an outsider (Carlson, 1962). The outsider, or the career-bound superintendent, comes to the school system from outside of that school system. The career of this individual as a superintendent is consistently spread over two or more school districts. Having been brought from the outside, this superintendent has never served the district in any other position. As a rule, the career-

bound superintendent does not stop with one superintendency. This educator makes a career of the superintendency rather than as a public school employee.

**Contrasting the Superintendent Types**

In summarizing his research Carlson, (1962) noted several important differences between the place-bound superintendent and the career-bound superintendent. Most importantly to this study is the observation that the place-bound superintendent may be more authoritarian in nature than the career-bound superintendent. The place-bound superintendent has a higher commitment to a specific community and a lower commitment to the career of the superintendency than does the career-bound superintendent. Although both have made investments and sacrifices to secure the credentials for the superintendency, a second major distinction between these superintendent types exists in the importance which the place-bound superintendent assigns to preference for a specific place, and the importance that the career-bound superintendent assigns to the career.

The place-bound superintendent appears to desire the position of superintendent only if it can be obtained in a specific place. This person puts place of employment above the career of superintendent. The career-bound superintendent puts career above place. This career-bound superintendent is not bound to a place; this superintendent maintains the vision for a career.

Carlson (1962) found that school boards select insiders to the superintendency only when the judgment has been made that the schools are being properly administered. The career-bound superintendent type is selected when the school board desires changes in the administration of the district. School boards give career-bound superintendents, but not insiders, a mandate to act in regard to organizational development and they provide necessary support to establish this development. Because the insider has a history in the school system, this person has more difficulty than the career-bound superintendent in persuading the school board that changes in the school system are needed.

The established social system within the school environment is temporarily suspended with the coming of an career-bound superintendent. With an place-bound superintendent, the established social system goes largely unaltered restricting the flexibility of the place-bound superintendent and forcing them to become authoritarian. The career-bound superintendent has the advantage of flexibility in coming to terms with the social system of the school district. Career-bound superintendents, more than place-bound superintendents, are able to expand the central office staff of the school system. This suggests that career-bound superintendents "retool" the organization, therefore, initiating more change than place-bound superintendents, yet are less authoritarian.

Career-bound superintendents give more attention to the development of new rules than do place-bound superintendents. When place-bound superintendents develop new rules they tend to be concerned with technical

and managerial problems. Career-bound superintendents also develop these types of rules, but they tend to develop new rules regarding institutional problems. Place-bound superintendents give attention to rules in such a way as to tighten the procedures that exist, creating a more authoritarian atmosphere. Career-bound superintendents tend to make rules which alter what exists. This may suggest that the career-bound superintendent is more of a leader, and the place-bound superintendent is more of a manager.

Place-bound superintendents tend to default to an authority relationships with teachers. They do not work actively and directly to gain teacher support. The heritage of relationships within the school system that belongs to the place-bound superintendent can be a hindrance in the management of internal group struggles. The career-bound superintendent is without a constraining heritage of relationships. The career-bound superintendent has the advantage of cultivating new professional working relationships, and constructing a positive rapport with the entire staff without a past history that hinders such development.

Career-bound superintendents define themselves as expendable in relationship to the school system. Place-bound superintendents see themselves as permanent. Place-bound superintendents look with less favor than do career-bound superintendents upon the prospect of movement to another superintendency. Place-bound superintendents stay in office longer than do career-bound superintendents. This has implication for organizational development because career-bound school superintendents look upon a long tenure in office as detrimental to their career development.

**General Hypothesized Roles of the Superintendent Types**

As the previous discussion indicates, the differences between the career-bound and the place-bound superintendent are numerous. An educational domain where these differences may have a major impact is in the collective bargaining process. The specific purpose of this study was to show the potentially diverse attitudes possessed by the career-bound superintendents and the place-bound superintendents with regard to the collective bargaining process.

In the collective bargaining process superintendents have several options with regard to their own involvement on the bargaining team which represents the management. Some superintendents choose to be on the bargaining team as an active member, even serving as the chief spokesperson. Others choose to participate on the team, but do not serve as the chief spokesperson. Some superintendents opt to delegate the negotiating responsibility to significant others, thus maintaining a passive relationship from what they perceive to be an often emotionally ridden activity.

While some management negotiating teams include superintendents, school board members, and building principals, other teams may include a professional negotiator, an attorney, an assistant superintendent, or other central office personnel. These various configurations are possibly a consequence of the differing and often contradictory attitudes of place-bound

and career-bound superintendents.

It is customarily the superintendent, with input and direction from the school board, who sets the tone for and eventually adjudicates who represents management during the collective bargaining process. This study was conducted to determine whether there are differences between place-bound superintendents and career-bound superintendents in terms of their attitudes toward collective bargaining process.

On the basis of the postulated authoritarian difference between the two superintendent types it was hypothesized in this study that the place-bound superintendent will possess an increased desire, relative to the career-bound superintendent, to be involved on the bargaining team, even serving as the chief negotiator. This type of superintendent may have more desire to maintain control at the bargaining table when negotiating than the career-bound superintendent. The place-bound superintendent may not be as amenable to utilizing a specialized negotiator, but may agree to the involvement of school board members. In general, the place-bound superintendent may not desire to delegate power or authority to another individual for the purposes of negotiating.

In this study, it was hypothesized that the career-bound superintendent would express a more negaitive attitude regarding participation the bargaining table than the place-bound superintendent. The career-bound superintendent may be more willing to delegate table negotiating authority to others. As with other executive level decision making, the effective leader maintains the faith and the confidence in subordinates to allow them responsibility without superordinate interference (Millett, 1987). The career-bound superintendent, as an effective leader, may be partial to involving other administrators in the negotiating process. This superintendent may be inclined to hire specialized negotiators as the chief negotiators, or will designate other school administrators to the task.

The career-bound superintendent may desire the experience of specialized administrators and specialized negotiators at the bargaining table. These specialized areas include school finance, staff personnel, building administration, and school business management (Rebore, 1987)

## PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY

### Instrumentation

There are four theoretically distinct sections associated with the instrument used in this study. The first section deals with the demographics used to categorize the superintendents as career-bound or place-bound, see Table 2. The second, third and fourth sections, see Table 3, deal with attitude regarding: Superintendent Involvement in negotiations, Specialized Negotiator Involvement in negotiations, and Team Management.

**Categorizing Superintendents.** Carlson (1962) described the place-bound superintendent as an insider, one who had ascended within the school system to obtain the superintendency. The place-bound superintendent

typically has served as the superintendent in only one school district. The career-bound superintendent was described as an individual who came to the system from the outside. The career-bound superintendent typically has served as the superintendent in two or more school districts.

The superintendents' responses to the nine demographic questions (see Table 2) provided a basis for all respondents to be categorized as either place-bound superintendents or career-bound superintendents. The following discussion presents the procedure that was used to categorize the respondents into mutually exclusive and exhaustive groupings of either place-bound or career-bound superintendents.

If a respondent possessed more than three years of experience, was experienced, as a superintendent (question C), and served as the superintendent in only one district (question D), this respondent was categorized as place-bound. If the respondent possessed more than three years of experience as a superintendent (question C), and had served in more than one district (question D), this respondent was categorized as career-bound. In both of these situations the categorization was clear and complete.

If the response to question C was "equal to or less than three years of experience", a beginning superintendent, additional information was used to determine the respondent's prospective movement in his or her respective career. Questions E, F, G, H, and I were used in the categorization of the beginning superintendent as either a place-bound superintendent or a career-bound superintendent.

Question I, indicates whether a respondent has worked in the present district in another administrative capacity. The beginning superintendent who answered "yes" to question I was categorized as place-bound. However, if the respondent indicated "no" to question I, the procedure was continued by referring to questions E, F,G and H. Those respondents giving a place-bound response to three out of four of these questions were categorized as place-bound. Those respondents giving a career-bound response to three out of four of these questions was categorized as career-bound. Those respondents splitting their responses evenly between the four questions were to be excluded from the study, however no such respondents were encountered.

Question E indicated whether or not the respondent planed to remain in the district. A response of "yes" to question E was considered a place-bound response. A response of "no" to question E was considered a career-bound response. Question F provided information regarding the superintendents' intentions to move on to another district at some time in the near future. A response indicating a planed move was considered a career-bound response. A response indicating no planed move in the near future was considered a place-bound response. Question G deals with geographic preference over career preference. A response indicating a geographic preference over a career preference was considered a place-bound response. Alternatively, a response indicating a career preference over a geographic preference was considered a career-bound response. Question H

deals with a willingness to relocate. A "yes" response to H is a career-bound response. A"no" response represents a very clear place-bound response.

**Measuring Attitude Toward: Superintendent Involvement and Use of Specialized Negotiators.** Initially, a large pool of attitudinal statements relating to collective bargaining was constructed. These statements were constructed so that they were related to two components, either Superintendent Involvement in collective bargaining or Specialized Negotiator Involvement in collective bargaining. This large pool was ultimately reduced to eighteen statements based on an extensive literature review and a pilot study. Responses to the statements were solicited using a five point likert scale, strongly disagree to strongly agree.

The Superintendent Involvement Component is represented in the instrument by nine statements (1, 2, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 21, and 22). This component deals with the involvement of the superintendent at the bargaining table. The Specialized Negotiator Involvement Component is also represented by nine statements (5, 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 23). This component deals with the involvement of Specialized Negotiators at the bargaining table.

**Table 1** Instrument Statements, Reference Basis For Construction and Component That They Were Initially Associated With: Superintendent Involvement (SI), Specialized Negotiator (SN), and Do Not Apply (DNA). - **about here**

Five additional statements (3, 4, 6, 7, and 14) were included as distractors. These statements were developed around the concept of team management, but were in no way related to the two major components of this study and were not considered in any analyses associated with this study.

**Sample**

Systematic random sampling was used to select a sample of 300 superintendents from the currently defined population of 615 Ohio school superintendents. To reduce the possibility of sampling error, five systematic samples were selected and then pooled together to form one large sample. Each pass through the list resulted in 60 respondents being selected, thus 300 respondents defined the total target sample. The 300 questionnaires were mailed. Two hundred forty-one satisfactory questionnaires, 80% of the total sample, were returned in usable form to define the empirical data base.

One hundred ninety-three of the respondents were categorized as experienced superintendents and 47 were categorized as beginning superintendents. Of the experienced superintendents 94 were categorized as career-bound, while 100 were categorized as place-bound. For the beginning superintendents 19 were categorized as career-bound and 28 were categorized as place-bound. Thus, there were 113 career-bound and 128 place-bound superintendents defining this sample. The two types of superintendents are

described with regard to the demographic data in Table 2.

**Table 2** Demographics information for career-bound (N= 113) and place-bound (N=128) superintendents. - **about here**

**Factor Analyses**

**Initial Confirmatory Factor Analysis**. Implicit in this study was the expectation that the Superintendent Involvement statements and the Specialized Negotiator statements represented two distinct factors. Confirmatory factor analysis, specifically Bentler's (1989) EQS was used to test the factor validity of the attitude instrument.

The 18 attitude responses of the 241 superintendents were hypothesized to define two correlated factors: nine statements defining Superintendent Involvement and nine statements defining Specialized Negotiator. The results of this analysis are reported in the first row of Table 3. Clearly the two factor hypothesized solution does not fit these data. The very large, and significant, chi square indicates a rather poor fit. Joreskog and Sorbom (1979) have argued that with large degrees of freedom one frequently obtains significant chi squares, even when it may be difficult to improve a model. They suggest that a better test of goodness of fit for large degrees of freedom is to compute the ratio of the chi square to its degrees of freedom. While they do not provide a specific rejection value for this value they tend to conclude that ratios of two or less are indicative of reasonable fits. For these data the associated ratio is approximately 3.60, further suggesting an inadequate fit.

Bentler (1990) have suggested several variations of a fit index as a measure of the quality of a confirmatory factor solution. This index ranges from zero, poorest possible fit, to unity, a perfect fit. He suggests that an index greater than .90 is indicative of a good fit of the associated sample data to the hypothesized model. Three additional measures of fit were also computed for this confirmatory factor analysis: Bentler-Bonnett normed fit index, .69; Bentler-Bonnett non-normed fit index, .71; Bentler-Bonnett comparative fit index, .75. The original hypothesized two factor solution fails to fit by these criteria also.

**Table 3** Confirmatory Factor Analysis Indices Of Fit For Initial Two Factor Model And Subsequent Four Factor Model - **about here**

In an attempt to determine subgroupings of statements that would have adequate factor validity the 18 statements were factor analyzed using a Kaiser image analysis followed by Hofmann's orthotran transformation (see Feldman, Gagon, Hofmann and Simpson, 1989). A four factor reference structure solution was determined. A substantive loading was defined as a correlation between statement and factor that was equal to or greater than .40. Four statements, all Superintendent Involvement statements, did not load

on any factor. The remaining fourteen statements and their exploratory factor loadings are presented by factor in Table 4.

In Table 4 the variables have been ordered from largets to smallest loading, correlation with factor, within factor. The first factor is defined solely by Superintendent Involvement statements and is named Superintendent Involvement. The remaining three factors are all defined by statements dealing with the Specialized Negotiator statements. Factor 2 addresses the issue of attitude toward the content of a specialized negotiator team and is labeled as Negotiating Team. Factor 3 deals with attitude toward the use of someone who is especially trained as a negotiator and is labeled Specialized Negotiator. Factor 4 suggests that generally only the assistant superintendent is viewed as being acceptable as a substitute for the superintendent at the bargaining table. This factor has been labeled Superintendent Substitute.

**Table 4** Exploratory And Confirmatory Reference Structure Loadings For The Hypothesized Factor Model Based on Exploratory Factor Analysis - **about here**

**Second Confirmatory Analysis.** The exploratory factor analysis suggested that the original Specialized Negotiator factor should be subdivided into three distinct factors and that the Superintendent Involvement factor remained intact, even though four of its statements were eliminated. A second confirmatory factor analysis was carried out using the exploratory factors, as defined in Table 4, as a replacement model for the original two factor model. The summary results of this second analysis are reported in Table 3. The third row of Table 3 reports the reduction in chi square when the exploratory model is used in place of the original two factor model. There is a large, statistically significant, reduction in the chi square value. The exploratory solution is a much better fit that the original two factor solution. While the chi square associated with the exploratory solution is still significant it is clearly within the acceptable range suggested by Joreskog and Sorbom (1979). Two of the three fit indices are greater than .90 and the third index is for all practical purposes a .90. The structure loadings associated with the confirmatory factor analysis are also reported in Table 4, as the second major column. The coefficient alpha reliability coefficients for each scale are reported after the factor name associated with the scale. The factor intercorrelations associated with the exploratory and confirmatory analyses are reported in Table 6. A visual inspection comparing the exploratory and confirmatory loadings further affirms the adequacy of the exploratory model. It was concluded that the exploratory solution defined an adequate model for the data. Therefore, four rather than two factors are assumed to define the factor structure of the 14 statement attitude instrument.

**Table 5** Confirmatory (CFA), Exploratory (EFA) and Empirical (OBS) Factor Intercorrelations - **about here**

**Analyses of Subscore Means by Superintendent Type**

The statement responses associated with each factor were averaged to determine an empirical score, *factor based scale score,* for each respondent on the factor. Mean scores by superintendent type are reported in Table 6. Within each factor an analysis of variance was carried out using the factor score as the dependent variable and superintendent type as the independent variable. The F-ratios and their associated probabilities are also reported in Table 6. There are significant differences by superintendent type on three of the four factors. By reporting subscores on the factors as an individual's average response to the items defining the factor it is possible to immediately determine whether the group responses are either in the negative response range, significantly ($P < .01$) less than three, or in the positive range, significanty ($p < .01$) greater than 3, or in the neutral range, not greater than or less than 3. In parentheses after each mean is a symbol noting whether the associated mean is positive, negative or neutral.

**Table 6** Subgroup Means, Standard Deviations, And F-ratios For Differences On Each Factor Scale - **about here**

## FINDINGS , INTERPRETATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

**Place-Bound and Career-Bound Superintendents - Their Demographics**

When classifying the superintendents into the two categories 194 of the 241 respondents were classified as experienced superintendents and were categorized on the basis of their responses to question D. One hundred of the experienced superintendents were classified as place-bound, having only worked in a single school district as a superintendent. Ninety-four of the experienced superintendents have worked in more than one school district as a superintendent and were classified as career-bound.

Although questions F, G, H and I were used to classify the inexperienced superintendents all superintendents responded to them. Looking at Table 2 it can be seen that as a group place-bound superintendents are very different from career-bound superintendents on many of the demographics. For the most part these differences are consistent with the differences that might be predicted on the basis of Carleson's theoretical model. These many significant differences on variables not used to classify a majority of the respondents suggest that the classification procedure has excellent validity.

The superintendent groups were not significantly different in years of experience as an educator. Several differences were not anticipated. A career-bound superintendent is approximately three times more likely to have a doctorate than a place-bound superintendent. A majority of the place-bound superintendents are in small districts, ADM of 1500 or less, while a majority of the career-bound superintendents are in districts with an ADM greater than 1500. Career-bound superintendents have significantly more

superintendent experience than place-bound superintendents.

**Attitude Factors and Scales**

The attitude statements used in this study were initially hypothesized, and constructed, as defining two general attitudes: Superintendent Involvement in collective bargaining and Specialized Negotiator Involvement in collective bargaining. A confirmatory factor analysis, Table 3, indicated that the statements were not adequately defined by these two factors. A subsequent exploratory factor analysis suggested that the statements are most likely represented by four rather than by two factors. One of the four factors is a Superintendent Involvement factor, being defined by five of the original nine Superintendent Involvement statements. The remaining three factors are all defined by the nine statements associated with the original Specialized Negotiator Involvement and represent factorial different aspects of a very general Specialized Negotiator Involvement attitude domain. A second confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to test the adequacy of the new exploratory model. The results of the second confirmatory factor analysis suggest that the four factor exploratory model is quite adequate to explain the structure of the data, Table 2 and 2. The content of these factors is indicated in Table 3 along with their associated coefficient alpha reliabilities. The four factors have excellent reliability and excellent factor loadings. The original expectations regarding career-bound and place-bound superintendent's attitudes toward the collective bargaining domain can still be tested.

**Factor 1: Superintendent Involvement**. Factor 1 is a clear superintendent involvement factor. It was theorized that place-bound superintendents would have a stronger preference to be involved and in control of the bargaining process than the career-bound superintendent. As reported in Table 6 this expectation was confirmed. As expected career-bound superintendents hold a negative attitude toward the involvement of the superintendent as a major participant at the collective bargaining table. The place-bound superintendent, on the other hand, has a strong positive attitude toward the superintendent being involved as an active participant at the bargaining table.

**Factor 2: Makeup of the Bargaining Team.** Factor 2 deals with the membership content of the bargaining team. Both groups of superintendents had very strong, and statistically equivalent, positive attitudes Table 6, regarding suggested membership expertise on the bargaining team.: curriculum, staff personnel, and school finance but not a school business manager , Table 4. Furthermore each group of superintendents were most homogeneous in their responses to this factor suggesting that not only are they generally positive regarding this factor - they are also positive with few superintendents deviating from this strong positive perspective. The statements defining this factor do not deal with a specialized negotiator and do not deal with superintendent involvement so it is not surprising, in

retrospect, that both types of administrators would share similar positive attitudes about the suggested make-up of the bargaining team.

**Factor 3: Specialized Negotiator.** This factor, factor 3, embodies the essence of the original factor involving the use of specialized negotiators. All three statements deal with the use of a specialized negotiator that will most likely be brought in from the outside, Table 4. It is interesting to note that attitudes toward this factor are contrary to our original expectations that the career-bound superintendent would desire a specialized negotiator approach to collective bargaining. As a matter of fact both types of administrators have a negative attitude toward specialized negotiators. What is most surprising about this factor is that the career-bound superintendents have their strongest negative attitude associated with it. Furthermore, their attitude is significantly more negative than the place-bound superintendent's attitude, Table 6. The negative attitude of the place-bound superintendent was expected since their desire for autonomy would logically rule out the use of any outsider. Very clearly we were wrong about the career-bound superintendent's attitude regarding the use of specialized negotiators. It would appear that the career-bound superintendent has an even stronger negative attitude than the place-bound superintendent when it comes to the potential intrusion of an outsider's involvement in the collective bargaining process.

**Factor 4: Superintendent Substitute.** Ordinarily one might be tempted to dismiss a two variable factor as unimportant, but the reliability of factor 4 suggests otherwise, coefficient alpha = .86. Initially this was a very difficult factor to interpret. However, when considering it within the context of the other factors it provides some insights regarding the attitudes of the superintendents toward the bargaining table spokesperson. When considering the content of Superintendent Involvement factor the statement that is least definitive of the factor is the only statement dealing with the superintendent as the chief spokesperson for the bargaining team, statement 1. This Superintendent Substitute factor deals exclusively with the spokesperson for the bargaining. The place-bound superintendent's have a strong positive attitude toward this factor, but the career-bound superintendents appear to be neutral toward the factor. The place-bound superintendents are significantly more positive than the career-bound superintendents in terms of wanting to be a spokesperson for the bargaining team. It is clear that the place-bound superintendent wants to be very actively involved in the bargaining process. However, if the place-bound superintendent can not be the spokesperson for the negotiating team then he or she is likely to advocate having the assistant superintendent serve as the spokesperson, statement 10-factor 4. This thinking is reinforced when noting that the place-bound superintendent's had a strong positive mean response to statement 10, 3.49. The career-bound superintendents have strong feelings about not wanting to be directly involved at the bargaining table, factor 1, but when considering that their mean response to statement 10, 3.27, is positive

it is possible that they might have a slight preference to have their assistant superintendent be their spokesperson at the bargaining table, statement 10-factor 4. With regard to the other statement defining factor 4, statement 9, it is best to also look at the two group means on this statement. The career-bound superintendents simply do not have either a negative or positive attitude, mean = 2.93, about some other specially trained administrator from within the district being more suitable than they to serve as the negotiating team spokesperson. The place-bound superintendent has strong feelings of agreement that a specially trained administrator from within the district is not better suited than they to serve as negotiating team spokesperson. It is possible that the place-bound superintendents' desire for autonomy is influencing their response to Factor 4 - they are willing to have an assistant superintendent that they probably know that they can control, but are quite unwilling to risk having some other administrator that they may not be able to control.

**Summary**

All superintendents regardless of type are in agreement with the suggestion that the bargaining team be comprised of specialists that are knowledgeable in the area of: curriculum, staff personnel and school finance. Neither group of superintendents is in favor of having a specialized "outside" negotiator involved in the bargaining, with the career-bound superintendent having particularly strong negative feelings about this.

The statements receiving the strongest positive endorsement for both types of administrators are those statements associated with membership on the bargaining team. When excluding those statements the two strongest positive endorsements given by the place-bound superintendents are to statement one, (3.68), and then statement two, (3.76). Two of the five most negative endorsements given by the career-bound superintendents are to statements one, (1.82), and two, (2.29). The greatest mean differences between the two superintendent types are on statements 1 and 2, with statement 1 defining the largest difference. Statement 1 clearly presents the position that the superintendent should be the chief spokesperson for the bargaining team while statement 2 makes it clear that the superintendent should be an active participant at the bargaining table. A primary conclusion of this research study is that the place-bound superintendent desires to be active at the collective bargaining table while the career-bound superintendent does not seek to be involved at the collective bargaining table in any capacity, Factor 1. A position supported by this research is that the place-bound superintendent is more authoritarian than the career-bound superintendent. It is plausible to assume from this research that the place-bound superintendents do desire to occupy the "in-charge" role at the bargaining table, especially given their strong positive endorsement of statements 1 and 2. The place-bound superintendent seeks to control the bargaining process as a spokesperson and an active member of the bargaining team. The career-bound superintendent is likely to be concerned with those repercussions from the bargaining table

that may effect the educational process. It is also likely that the the career-bound superintendent, not personally serving on the bargaining team, will either delegate the spokesperson responsibility to a significant other or delegate the responsibility of determining the spokesperson to the bargaining team as long as they do not advocate bringing in an outside specialized negotiator.

**Implications**

Future research along the lines of this research should consider the contextual differences which exist in public school districts, specifically, with regard to the use of Specialized Negotiators. Because school districts are intricate and diverse, contextual problems arise in the assessment of attitudes. The context in which the statements are interpreted makes a difference in the response given. Therefore, in order to better understand Superintendent Involvement in collective bargaining certain statements should be cast in several different contexts. To compensate for these contextual differences, it is recommended that future research consider the inclusion of statements that supplement the original attitudinal statements. For example, the statement, *"The management team should utilize the expertise of a specialized negotiator at the bargaining table."* could be rephrased to, *"In the best possible situation the management team should utilize the expertise of a specialized negotiator at the bargaining table."* But, it could also be cast in another context, such as, *"If the school district has the adequate funds, a specialized negotiator is a better choice as the chief negotiator than the superintendent."* While the addition of supplemental items would lengthen the instrument, they would also contribute to the instruments generalizability.

If a school board is considering the selection of an insider, likely a place-bound superintendent, it is probable that this individual will select the role of chief negotiator at the collective bargaining table. In contrast, the selection of an outsider, career-bound superintendent, may provide the board with a superintendent that will not wish to become involved in the negotiating at the collective bargaining table. This study makes it clear that the career-bound superintendent does not want to be actively involved in the bargaining and does not want an outside negotiator - but it is not clear who the career-bound superintendent will support as a spokesperson for the management team. It is advisable for the school board to quiz the outsider on this issue.

The demographics from this study suggest a relationship between superintendent type and: (a) the size of the school district;(b) the level of education of the superintendent. They also suggest other very strong relationships between superintendent type and willingness to "stick" with a superintendency.

Regardless of a superintendent's place-bound or career-bound tendencies, this research may assist the novice administrator in developing a philosophy regarding the superintendent's role in collective bargaining which will lead to more effective leadership.

## REFERENCES

Bentler, P. M. ( 1990). **Theory and implementation of EQS a structural equations program, version 3.0.** Los Angeles, CA: BMDP Statistical Software.

Carlson, R. O. (1962). **Executive succession and organizational change: Place-bound and career-bound superintendents of schools.** Midwest Administration Center: The University of Chicago, Chicago, IL.

Crisci, P. E., & Herpel, R. (1984). **Win/Win: An anatomy of an alternative approach.** (Monograph No. 3). Kent, OH: Ohio Center for School Personnel Relations.

Cunningham, L. L., & Hentges, J. T. (1982). **The American school superintendency: 1982, A summary report.** Arlington, VA: American Association Of School Administrators.

Feldman, D. S., Gagon, J., Hofmann, R., Simpson, J. (1988) **Statview II: The solution for data analysis and presentation graphics.** Berkeley, CA: Abacus Concepts, Inc.

Gonder, P. O. (1981). **Collective bargaining: Problems and solutions.** Sacramento, CA: American Association of School Administrators, Education News Service.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1987). **Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice.** (3rd ed.). New York: Random House

Igoe, J. A., & Flynn, D. M. (1972). **The school board negotiator: Guidelines for effective teacher negotiations.** New York: Thealan Associates, Inc.

Joreskog & Sorbon (1979) **MISSING**

Lyden, R. A. (1974). **The use and efficacy of an outside negotiator specialist by boards of education in selected Ohio schools.** Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Miami University, Oxford, OH.

Millett, J. D. (1987, November 12). Personal interview.

Randles, H. (1982). **Handbook for negotiators in the public sector.** Nashville, TN: Research and Service Institute.

Rebore, R. W. (1987). **Personnel administration in education: A management approach.** (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Webster, W. G. (1985). **Effective collective bargaining in public education.** Ames, IA: The Iowa State University Press.

**Table 1.** Instrument Statements, Reference Basis For Construction and Component That They Were Initially Associated With: Superintendent Involvement (SI), Specialized Negotiator (SN), and Do Not Apply (DNA).

| Initial Component | Statement Number | Statement and Reference Basis Used to Construct Statement |
|---|---|---|
| SI | 1. | The superintendent should be the chief spokesperson for the management bargaining team. (Crisci & Herpel, 1984), (Gonder, 1981) |
| SI | 2. | It is best if the superintendent participate at the bargaining table. (Gonder, 1981)-reflected |
| DNA | 3. | School board members should not be on the bargaining team. |
| DNA | 4. | Building principals should have a voice in planning the bargaining strategy for the management team. |
| SN | 5. | The management team should utilize the expertise of a specialized negotiator at the bargaining table. Cunningham and Hentges (1982), (Webster, 1985) |
| DNA | 6 | Central office personnel should be included at the bargaining table. |
| DNA | 7 | Principals have no place on the bargaining team. |
| SI | 8 | Superintendents are the most appropriately trained individuals for verbal interaction at the bargaining table. Randles (1982), (Igoe & Flynn, 1972) |
| SN | 9 | Specially trained administrators, from within the school district, are better suited for the role of spokesperson than the superintendent. Cunningham and Hentges (1982), (Webster, 1985) - reflected |
| SN | 10 | An assistant superintendent is best suited to serve as the spokesperson. Cunningham and Hentges (1982), (Webster, 1985) |
| SI | 11 | The involvement of the superintendent at the bargaining table interferes with overall staff relations. Gonder (1981) |
| SI | 12 | The involvement of the superintendent at the bargaining table enhances the administration of the contract. Gonder (1981) |
| SI | 13 | The bargaining process is best controlled when the superintendent is active at the table. Carlson (1962) |
| DNA | 14 | The school treasurer should be a member of the bargaining team. |
| SI | 15 | Remaining away from the table, the superintendent should have full knowledge and control of the bargaining activities through the spokesperson. Brown (1988) |
| SN | 16 | Specialized "outside" negotiators are best suited to serve as the chief negotiators. Cunningham and Hentges (1982), Lyden (1974), Gonder (1981) |
| SN | 17 | An individual with a specialty in school finance must be included on the bargaining team. (Rebore, 1987) |
| SN | 18 | At least one member of the bargaining team should have a thorough understanding of staff personnel. (Rebore, 1987) |
| SN | 19 | The school business manager must not be involved on the team.(Rebore, 1987) - reflected |
| SN | 20 | An administrator with an expertise in curriculum and instruction must be included on the team. |
| SI | 21 | The demanding nature of the superintendency makes it difficult for the superintendent to serve as the chief negotiator. Gonder (1981) |
| SI | 22 | The collective bargaining process is too crucial an event to be carried on without the superintendent active at the table. Gonder (1981) |
| SN | 23 | A specialized negotiator trained in public sector collective bargaining is best suited to serve as the chief negotiator. Gonder (1981) |

**Table 2.** Demographics for career-bound (N= 113) and place-bound (N=128) superintendents.

| | | | career | place | statistic | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | How many years of experience do you have as an educator? | mean = | 24.96 | 24.45 | F=.13 | (1,239) | .72 |
| | | s.d = | 5.32 | 5.35 | | | |
| B | In how many educational institutions have you been employed? | mean = | 4.94 | 3.37 | F=43.36 | (1,239) | <.001 |
| | | s.d = | 1.94 | 1.77 | | | |
| C | How many years have you been a superintendent? | mean = | 10.04 | 7.27 | F=14.53 | (1,239) | <.001 |
| | | s.d = | 6.35 | 4.95 | | | |
| D | In how many districts have you been a superintendent? | mean = | 2.04 | 1.03 | F=116.89 | (1,239) | <.001 |
| | | s.d = | 1.03 | .17 | | | |
| E | If you have 3 or fewer years experience and have remained in one school district, do you plan to remain in that position for another five years? | yes | 45% | 72% | $\chi^2$=3.75 | 1 | .053 |
| | | no | 55% | 28% | | | |
| | | | N = 15 | N = 20 | | | |
| F | Do you plan to advance to another school district in the near future? | yes | 35% | 13% | $\chi^2$=15.17 | 2 | <.001 |
| | | no | 65% | 87% | | | |
| G | Is your place of employment (location) more important to you than your career as a superintendent? | yes | 31% | 63% | $\chi^2$=23.91 | 1 | <.001 |
| | | no | 69% | 37% | | | |
| H | Would you be willing to relocate to accept a "better" superintendency? | yes | 83% | 61% | $\chi^2$=14.54 | 1 | <.001 |
| | | no | 17% | 39% | | | |
| I | Did you work for your district in another administrative capacity before becoming the superintendent? | yes | 27% | 67% | $\chi^2$=37.97 | 1 | <.001 |
| | | no | 73% | 33% | | | |
| J | Degree | Master | 60% | 87% | $\chi^2$=25.76 | 2 | <.001 |
| | | Doctorate | 40% | 12% | | | |
| K | ADM | 1500 or less | 33% | 51% | $\chi^2$=16.95 | 2 | <.001 |
| | | 1501 to 3999 | 42% | 42% | | | |
| | | 4000 or more | 25% | 12% | | | |

**Table 3.** Confirmatory Factor Analysis Indices Of Fit For Initial Two Factor Model And Subsequent Four Factor Model.

| | $\chi^2$ | df | $\chi^2$/df | *p* | Bentler-Bonnett fit1 | fit2 | fit3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Two factor hypothesized solution | 482 | 134 | 3.60 | p<.001 | .69 | .71 | .75 |
| Exploratory four factor solution | 126 | 71 | 1.77 | p<.001 | .89 | .94 | .95 |
| $\chi^2$ reduction 356 | | 63 | | p<.001 | | | |

**Table 4.** Exploratory And Confirmatory Reference Structure Loadings For The Hypothesized Factor Model Based on Exploratory Factor Analysis.

| statement | Reliability | factor loading CFA | EFA | statement content |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Factor 1** | **α = 83** | | | **Superintendent Involvement** |
| 22 | | .78 | .82 | The collective bargaining process is too crucial an event to be carried on without the superintendent active at the table. |
| 2 | | .84 | .75 | It is best if the superintendent participates at the bargaining table. |
| 12 | | .73 | .70 | The involvement of the superintendent at the bargaining table enhances the administration of the contract. |
| 13 | | .73 | .62 | The bargaining process is best controlled when the superintendent is active at the table. |
| 1 | | .68 | .48 | The superintendent should be the chief spokesperson for the management bargaining team. |
| **Factor 2** | **α = .62** | | | **Bargaining Team** |
| 20 | | .60 | .74 | An administrator with an expertise in curriculum and instruction must be included on the team. |
| 18 | | .62 | .71 | At least one member of the bargaining team should have a thorough understanding of staff personnel. |
| 17 | | .53 | .66 | An individual with a specialty in school finance must be included on the bargaining team. |
| 19 | | .48 | .63 | The school business manager must not be involved on the team. |
| **Factor 3** | **α = .69** | | | **Specialized Negotiators** |
| 23 | | .82 | .82 | A specialized negotiator trained in public sector collective bargaining is best suited to serve as the chief negotiator. |
| 16 | | .82 | .79 | Specialized "outside" negotiators are best suited to serve as the chief negotiators. |
| 5 | | .72 | .70 | The management team should utilize the expertise of a specialized negotiator at the bargaining table. |
| **Factor 4** | **α = .86** | | | **Superintendent Substitute** |
| 10 | | .57 | .80 | An assistant superintendent is best suited to serve as the spokesperson. |
| 9 | | .90 | .79 | Specially trained administrators, from within the school district, are not better suited for the role of spokesperson than the superintendent. |

**Table 5.** Confirmatory (CFA), Exploratory (EFA)and Empirical Factor Based Scale Scores (OBS) Intercorrelations.

| | Supt. Involv. | | | Barg. Team | | | Supt. Subst. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CFA | EFA | OBS | CFA | EFA | OBS | CFA | EFA | OBS |
| Barg Team | .05 | -.09 | .02 | | | | | | |
| Supt. Subst. | .53 | .40 | .47 | -.11 | -.01 | -.11 | | | |
| Special. Negot. | .39 | .13 | .33 | -.06 | -.04 | -.06 | .10 | .26 | .09 |

**Table 6.** Subgroup Means, Standard Deviations, And F-ratios For Differences On Each Factor Scale .

| | mean[1] | | stan. dev. | | F-ratio[2] | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | career | place | career | place | | |
| Superintendent Involvement | 2.49 (-) | 3.53 (+) | .86 | .87 | 85.95 | <.0001 |
| Bargaining Team | 3.62 (+) | 3.68 (+) | .66 | .56 | .58 | .4459 |
| Specialized Negotiator | 1.95 (-) | 2.55 (-) | .84 | 1.08 | 85.95 | <.0001 |
| Superintendent Substitute | 3.10 (n) | 3.41 (+) | .97 | .74 | 7.78 | .0057 |

[1] The symbols (+), (n), and (-) following each mean indicate whether the mean is significantly ($p< .01$) greater than, equal to, or significantly ($p< .01$) less than 3; a positive, neutral or negative mean.

[2]All F-ratios are based on (1,239) degrees of freedom.